

Friends remember Chuck being incredibly happy on his wedding day, shedding tears as he said his vows. Chuck was a very sensitive person, who wore his emotions on his sleeve.

The same qualities that made Chuck an exceptional human being made him an exceptional soldier. He was beloved by his fellow service men and women. In a deployment to Kosovo, Chuck earned the nickname "Cabbage Patch," because of, what his sister Teresa describes as, "his chunky face, deep blue eyes, and blonde hair." His buddies made a gift of a modified cabbage patch kid to Chucky by giving the doll a "high and tight" hair cut, adding some tattoos, and dressing it in tiny BDU's. Chuck's mother still has that doll. It sits in a room dedicated to her son in Alexandria, AL.

In Iraq, Chuck led a squad of 10 men. They specialized in mine clearing, bridge building, and in assisting the Iraqi patrols. Their mission was one of rebuilding and security. In carrying out this mission, Chuck was known for protecting his men, putting their safety before his own. He often led patrols, "on point," meaning he was out front in combat formations, leaving himself the most exposed to danger. This leadership style led to a Purple Heart, when Chuck was wounded by shrapnel from a previous roadside explosive, and earned him the admiration of his fellow soldiers.

SSG Scott Swanson speaks for many of those who knew Chuck when he said this:

[He] was a great NCO—one who soldiers looked up to for knowledge, strength, and most of all, courage. I'm honored to be able to call [Chuck] my brother in arms.

In an email posted on an Internet tribute to Chuck, fellow serviceman Sergeant Shane Uras, wrote the following:

Chuck—it's been two months now, and I'm still having trouble getting it through my head that you're gone. I love you bro, and there's not a day that goes by that your memory doesn't make me a stronger person. You were my best friend and godfather to my son Luca. . . . We are having a huge party when we get back in your memory and were going to send the video of it and other videos to your parents so they understand how big a part you played in our lives while you were away from them. I love you man, and I'm proud to have known you. Your country is grateful for your sacrifice—I know my family and I are. God bless you Chuck!

It is hard to lose someone like Chuck Webb. He was the anchor of his unit. His comrades looked to him for strength and depended on him to keep them safe. Such a role was not new for Chuck. His life was one of service to others. He was a caring, sensitive, devoted person who, quite literally, would—and did—give the "coat off his back."

The following lines, from Emily Dickinson, seem, in a way, to have guided Chuck's life. She wrote:

"If I can stop one heart from breaking,
I shall not live in vain.
If I can ease one life the aching,

Or cool one pain,
Or help one fainting robin unto his nest
again,
I shall not live in vain."

Chuck Webb was a good person, who cared so much—so deeply—about others. We owe it to him to celebrate his life—a life devoted to easing the aches and cooling the pains of so many others. It is in these good deeds that his memory lives on.

My wife, Fran, and I continue to keep Chuck's family and in our thoughts and in our prayers.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

IMMIGRATION

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I will make some remarks on an amendment I have offered—S.A. 1140—along with Senators HATCH and GRASSLEY that is dealing with the appropriation of \$5 million, with that amount equally divided between two purposes. One, facilitating the Department of Homeland Security entering into memorandums of understanding with States and localities under section 287(G) of the Immigration and Naturalization Act. That is, the ability to enter into memorandums or agreements with States and localities in order that they may participate in a positive way in helping enforce the immigration laws of the United States. And, two, reimbursing States and localities for the costs they incur in training their law enforcement officers under these memorandums of understanding. Reimbursement would be permitted for expenses such as those related to travel and transportation to the training location, subsistence payments or per diem allowance and costs for securing temporary replacements for law enforcement personnel who are participating in the Federal training.

I am pleased Senators HATCH and GRASSLEY have cosponsored the amendment. I hope each of my colleagues will carefully consider it and vote for its passage.

The amendment is needed to confront two issues currently prohibiting the nationwide advancement of agreements under INA section 287(G). This is a provision in the Immigration Code that provides for cooperative agreements to be entered into—it is a section that is not being adequately utilized.

First, there is a lack of Department of Homeland Security personnel tasked with negotiating and overseeing the entry into 287(G) training agreements with the States. There is also a shortage of DHS resources and trainers to conduct State and local training courses in a timely manner, including annual refresher courses for States

such as Alabama that have already entered into 287(G) MOU.

Second, States that enter into MOUs must currently absorb the cost related to pulling their law enforcement officers off duty and sending them to an intensive 5- to 6-week training course. They are extensively trained under these agreements. If a State does not have the money to pay for these extended leaves of absence or to hire replacements for the law enforcement officers wanting to receive immigration enforcement training, then costs related to the training under the MOU can prohibit States from being able to participate.

If costs are prohibitive, many States will simply choose to go forward in the realm of immigration law enforcement either without training, or generally not participate in any meaningful way.

Immigration training for State and local officers is important to many of my colleagues. I hope they will recognize that this amendment is the way to show their support for such training.

In the realm of immigration law enforcement, the State of Alabama struggled for years to achieve effective cooperation between Federal enforcement entities and our State and local law enforcement officers. All too often I heard the same story from our Alabama sheriffs and police chiefs: We call Immigration and Naturalization Service when we arrest an illegal alien, and they say they do not have the time to pick them up. They tell us to let them go. They have told me, on occasion, that INS told local officers unless they had 15 or 18 individuals at one time, don't bother to call them.

As a result, Alabama requested that additional Federal immigration agents be assigned to the State, Alabama advocated that extra immigration detention bedspace be established in the state, and Alabama requested the Immigration and Naturalization Service be responsive to requests that illegal aliens be taken into Federal custody. Though some progress was made, most of the requests were only partially met, at best.

To address the problems, I arranged for an Immigration and Customs enforcement officer to travel to the State of Alabama for 2 weeks to train all of our State troopers on cooperation with the Federal Government in the enforcement of Federal immigration laws. State troopers reviewed fake documents, were taught about different categories of aliens, legal and illegal, and were shown how to use a computer database at the Law Enforcement Support Center (LESC), a database that had been used only three times in the State of Alabama the year before the training because the officers simply did not know how to use it.

In September of 2003, Alabama followed in the footsteps of the State of Florida and became the second State in the Nation to enter into an INA 287(G) agreement with the Federal Government. This law has been on the books

for over a decade, but was not used until after 9-11. It is a tragedy we fail to take now advantage of the opportunity this law provides. That agreement allowed for a select group of 21 Alabama State troopers to receive extensive immigration enforcement training and gave them the authority to perform immigration and enforcement functions which resulted in their active communication with the Federal immigration agents stationed in the State—these agreements ought to be done routinely in every State in America.

After the MOU was negotiated and signed, the Department of Homeland Security sent personnel to Alabama to train the first class for a 5-week period. I thought 2 weeks was more than sufficient to my way of thinking. A deputy sheriff or city police officer can arrest a Senator for committing crimes in his community, but I suppose we have to have a 5-week training before they can arrest somebody who is not a citizen for violation of our immigration laws.

They were trained in how to identify fraudulent immigration documents, and in how to work together with federal agents to enforce immigration laws. I strongly believe that the MOU has been the most important step in Alabama in the realm of immigration enforcement. As a result of the MOU, Alabama State troopers have performed close to 200 criminal and illegal alien apprehensions, largely of aliens involved with document fraud, drug trafficking, and human smuggling, and have seized close to \$750,000 in drug, document and human trafficking related cash.

Because of the MOU, new Federal immigration agents have been assigned to the State of Alabama, dramatically increasing the Federal immigration enforcement presence in the State. This February, DHS announced the Alabama MOU would not only be continued but would be expanded, a second class of 25 State troopers is scheduled to be trained by DHS this October. The MOU Alabama entered into has added to the knowledge and resources available to Alabama's Department of Public Safety and has changed the level of cooperation we receive from the Federal immigration enforcement entities on a daily basis.

I am certain the State of Alabama will seek to continue the agreement for many years to come. I am hopeful other States will follow the lead of Alabama so that they, too, can benefit from the cooperative partnerships fostered by 287(G) MOUs.

Why is this important? It is important for one reason. We have just over 2,000 federal agents nationwide who are not on the borders of our country and charged with the responsibility of apprehending and enforcing immigration laws throughout the heartland of America.

There is no way those 2,000 officers can ever adequately patrol our streets for immigration violators and do a

good job of handling these problems. But we have 750,000 State and local law enforcement officers who are on our streets and in our communities every single day, apprehending people for DUIs, apprehending people during fights, apprehending people for other activities that bring them to the notice of law enforcement. In the course of that, they often discover these people are here illegally. They, as a result, should be subject to the enforcement of immigration laws by the State and local officers that discover them. If we have any respect for law in this country at all that is what should happen, but that is not occurring.

So how do we get to that point? They tell us they have to have all this training to be qualified. OK, let's give them training. I do not know that we need a full 5 weeks for every officer out there, but I think it is quite helpful that some of these officers have a good and sincere training to be more effective. If we train them and clarify their authority, we will have thousands of new officers patrolling our streets all over America at no cost to the Federal Government, watching out on our streets and in our communities for those who violate our laws. That is what we ought to be doing if we are serious at all about enforcing the laws of this country. I think the American people are. I think those of us in Congress need to get serious about it.

I think MOUs under 287(G) of the INA are a good place to start and need to be expanded. Under these MOUs, officers receive good training. The program creates good cooperation between local law enforcement and Federal agents. They learn how each others' systems work, and they develop memoranda as to what will happen if somebody is apprehended, whom they should call, how they should be detained, how long they should be detained, where they should be taken, and who is going to be compensated for that effort.

In conclusion, I think this amendment will make it financially attractive for more States to participate in these agreements. After all, they are helping enforce Federal immigration law. Why shouldn't we assist them in paying for the training we want them to receive? State and local police forces can make a difference in these efforts. I am excited we will perhaps be moving forward with this amendment. It will make a big difference.

I understand the managers are not here tonight and will not call up the amendment or attempt to do so, but I have talked with the manager and, hopefully, we can make some progress on that.

Mr. President, I will share briefly that also tomorrow I expect to call up the S. 629, the mass transportation bill I have offered and believe strongly in. We had a hearing on it in the Judiciary Committee. I will seek unanimous consent to call up and to adopt S. 629. I understand there may be an objection. There is not an objection on the Repub-

lican side. There may be an objection on the Democratic side, although it did come out of our Judiciary Committee with bipartisan support. I am hopeful we can move this important bill forward.

We have seen now in Spain and in London that there are people who desire to attack our mass transit transportation systems. What the Department of Justice tells us is that we have gaps and loopholes in our current laws that deal with those that would attack our mass transit systems, and that those laws need to be tightened up. If we do so, it will help the investigators and prosecutors be more effective in prosecuting those who may seek to do us harm.

I think it is time to move on that legislation. After all, we have been working on it for over a year. I think everybody has had good opportunity to review it. I think it is in every way professional and fair and ought to be passed. I look forward to moving it. If there is some objection from Members, and they would like to share that with me, perhaps we can solve those difficulties and reach an accord and move this important piece of legislation forward. We absolutely do not need to have an attack on our mass transportation system in America and not have the tools for our prosecutors and investigators to prosecute it adequately. That bill, as I noted, the mass transportation bill, is S. 629. It is not an amendment to the appropriations bill on the floor tomorrow, but a piece of legislation that I expect to be offering.

Finally, Mr. President, I will also be offering tomorrow and would be calling up an amendment to this appropriations bill that deals with making sure our Federal officials enter into the National Crime Information Center the names and identifying factors of people who have absconded after having been arrested for illegal immigration. That amendment is S.A. 1139.

We have hundreds of thousands of absconders, people who have been apprehended in our country for being here illegally. Amazingly, this is what happens: They are apprehended, they are given a date for a deportation hearing, and they are released on bail prior to that hearing. Or sometimes they have the hearing and are to be deported on a given date, and they are released on bail at that time, with the order to show up for deportation.

For those who have been ordered deported and released on bail, to show up for deportation, we now have learned that over 87 percent of them do not show up to be deported and in some counties over 90 percent never show up for their initial hearings, these percentages really make a mockery of the law. It has to be discouraging to the agents who have gone out and worked these cases, just to see them released on bail, and nobody even enters their names in the National Crime Information Center database.

What is the National Crime Information Center database? This is the database that every police officer in America accesses when they apprehend someone to see if the person is wanted anywhere in the country. If you had a DUI in Washington State, and you did not show up for your trial, and they catch you in Mobile, AL, and you are entered in the NCIC because of your DUI in Washington State, the officers in Mobile will hold you, and send you back to Washington State for your trial. But if you jump bail and do not show up for your immigration hearing or for your deportation proceeding, you are not treated the same way, your information is not currently being entered into the NCIC.

So I have been raising this and talking about it for quite some time now, and I have raised it with top officials in the Department of Homeland Security, and they say they are working on it and trying to enter the names faster. I know they as of December of last year they only had about 15,000 names entered into the Immigration Violators File of the NCIC which is really pathetically small. We ought to have them all of the absconder immigration violator files entered in there. This amendment would provide \$1 million to make sure those names are entered into the system.

Tomorrow we will proceed, hopefully, to call that amendment up and I will seek to have it made a part of the appropriations bill that is moving forward.

Mr. President, I thank the Chair for your time tonight.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I believe we have, on behalf of the majority leader, Senator FRIST, some closing remarks and matters.

MEASURE PLACED ON THE CALENDAR—S. 1382

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I understand there is a bill at the desk that is due for a second reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

The clerk will read the title of the bill for the second time.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1382) to require the Secretary of the Interior to accept the conveyance of certain land, to be held in trust for the benefit of the Puyallup Indian tribe.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, in order to place the bill on the calendar under the provisions of rule XIV, I object to further proceeding.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection having been heard, the bill will be placed on the calendar.

MEASURE READ THE FIRST TIME—S. 1394

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I understand there is a bill at the desk. I ask for its first reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1394) to reform the United Nations, and for other purposes.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I ask for a second reading, and in order to place the bill on the calendar under the provisions of rule XIV, I object to my own request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection having been heard, the bill will receive its second reading on the next legislative day.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I rise today to discuss the issue of United Nations reform. This year marks the 60th anniversary of the founding of the United Nations. As you know, the U.N. emerged from the ashes of the Second World War with a mandate to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war and to reaffirm faith in fundamental human rights and in the dignity and worth of human beings.

These basic principles embodied in the U.N. charter are still significant in today's changed strategic environment. Yet, the scandals and mismanagement that has engulfed the organization threaten both its reputation and its relevance.

These scandals have resulted in a consensus that the U.N. must be reformed. Three major reports have been released in the past 7 months, including one by Secretary-General Kofi Annan, that outline the need for specific reforms to make the U.N. more efficient, more accountable, more transparent, and more effective in responding to the challenges we face today. I am pleased to see that there is agreement on this need. Yet, I remind my colleagues that when the current Secretary-General took office in January 1997, he vowed to make the hard decisions necessary to reform the institution.

But 8½ years have gone by, and he has been unwilling or unable to do so. In fact, reprehensible dealings and scandalous behavior at the U.N. has continued unabated.

Furthermore, the U.N. budget has grown by leaps and bounds. Over the past 4 years, the U.N. regular budget has increased by more than \$1.1 billion over a 2-year period—from \$2.5 billion to \$3.6 billion.

The U.S. is handed a bill from the U.N. for 22 percent of the cost, and whether or not we agree with the way the U.N. spends its money, we are expected to pay. And this does not take into account the costs of peacekeeping operations, which are expected to be over \$5 billion this year alone.

The Constitution gives to Congress the power of the purse and as such, it is our duty to monitor how the American taxpayers' money is spent. In the case of the massive waste, fraud, and abuse at the U.N., we must take action to rectify an untenable situation.

As the recent report issued by the USIP Task Force on the United Nations said, "Americans are vested in a

United Nations that embodies values of honesty, decency, and fair play."

Yet, the U.N. is hardly a model for these basic values.

The appalling kickbacks, bribes, and financial mismanagement of the Oil-for-Food program are the most obvious illustration of an insufficient oversight system within the U.N. The design of the program and the failure of the U.N. to properly monitor it allowed Saddam Hussein to pocket billions of dollars in money that was meant for the Iraqi people suffering under his brutal regime.

Sexual exploitation and abuse by U.N. peacekeepers serving in missions around the world is an intolerable abuse of trust by those who are supposed to be contributing to a peaceful resolution to conflict situations.

Embezzlement and extravagant personal spending have been documented at U.N. programs such as UNICEF, the United Nations Development Programme, and the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development.

Countries such as Zimbabwe, Cuba, and Sudan—known violators of the basic human rights of their citizens—have been included as members of the U.N. Commission on Human Rights and have used their position to manipulate its agenda to prevent resolutions that condemn their human rights records.

If the U.N. does not act boldly, and act now, it will have little credibility to serve as an organization that promotes the values in its Charter. As a European diplomat told me recently, however, the U.N. is incapable of reforming itself. It is quite good at issuing reports, having meetings, appearing contrite, and then resolutely promising to change when news reports publicize the details of the problems within the organization. But history has shown that U.S. leadership is critical to ensuring that meaningful reform is implemented at the U.N.

Last month, the House of Representatives passed comprehensive legislation that provides a framework for implementing U.N. reform. This effort was led by the Chairman of the House International Relations Committee, Mr. HYDE, who worked diligently to produce a responsible bill that addresses the need for serious, meaningful, and practical reform.

Today I am introducing this legislation in the Senate. I recognize that the method used in this bill to compel the U.N. to make these reforms may not be popular with some of my colleagues. But I feel that there is no other way to proceed.

This legislation requires that 50 percent of the U.S. contribution to the United Nations regular budget be withheld if specific reforms are not implemented. Before dismissing this approach, I urge my colleagues to examine the reforms mandated and the flexibility inherent in the legislation.

First, the reforms. Title I requires management and budgetary reforms to create a more streamlined, efficient,